

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,672	06/01/2001	Ryota Sugimoto	018961-054	8651
39083 75	590 09/07/2005		EXAM	INER
CERMAK & KENEALY, LLP			MATHEW, FENN C	
	ADDOCK RD SUITE B		A DT LDUT	D. DED MINADED
Alexandria, V	A 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3764	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			P	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/870,672	SUGIMOTO, RYOTA	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Fenn C. Mathew	3764	
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
WHIC - Exten after 9 - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DASSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)🖾	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Ju	ne 2005.		
•	•	action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	on of Claims	·		
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,4,5,9-20,22,23 and 32-45</u> is/are pen	iding in the application.		
4	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
Application	on Papers			
9) 🗌 -	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.		
•	Γhe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
= -	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) 🔲 /	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).	
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	· ·	ed in this National Stage	
	application from the International Bureau			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	;d.	
Attachment	t(s)			

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other: _

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/870,672 Page 2

Art Unit: 3764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 9-13, 20, 22-23, 32-37, and 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanley in view of Palmaz. Please refer to paragraphs 3-4 of the office action dated January 14, 2005. With respect to claim 32, based on the teachings of Palmaz it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide grooves (deformable portions) on the bent portions of the Shanley device as discussed in the previous office action. In addition, claims 38-43 are substantially similar to previously presented claims discussing location of the deformable portions as well as angles of the deformable portions. Furthermore, in view of the teachings of Palmaz, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose any specific interval between adjacent grooves (Palmaz, page 8).
- 3. Claims 14-19 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shanley in view of Palmaz as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Alt et al. (U.S. 5,788,979). Please refer to paragraph 5 of the above cited office action.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 06/25/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not

Application/Control Number: 09/870,672

Art Unit: 3764

been supported. Examiner respectfully disagrees as the teachings of Palmaz specifically cite the use of grooves on any portion of a stent. With regards to the annular configuration, Palmaz specifically states that it may be desirable to have symmetrical relationship between the grooves, or that one may form a serpentine pattern. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been inclined to utilize the teachings of Palmaz to meet the invention as claimed by the Applicant. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been inclined to provide grooves on any and all portions of a stent based on the teachings of Palmaz. Applicant has also argued that the grooves of Palmaz are meant for a different purpose, however Examiner respectfully points out that the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Application/Control Number: 09/870,672 Page 4

Art Unit: 3764

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fenn C. Mathew whose telephone number is (571) 272-4978. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am - 5:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fcm September 5, 2005

> MICHAEL A. BROWN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Michael 4 B wo